

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:

Cohausz & Florack
Patent- und Rechtsanwälte
Bleichstrasse 14 12.05.05
DE-402 11 Düsseldorf
Tyskland

Eingang: 15. APR. 2005

Frist bis: 12.06.05

Bearbeiter: 54/01 Erledigt: Gesehen**PCT**

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY
EXAMINING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 66)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

13-04-2005

Applicant's or agent's file reference

030229WO**REPLY DUE**

within 60 days from
the above date of mailing

International application No.

PCT/IB2003/001829

International filing date (day/month/year)

12-05-2003

Priority date (day/month/year)

-

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

G01C 21/00

Applicant

Nokia Corporation et al

- ☐ The written opinion established by the International Searching Authority:
☐ is ☐ is not
considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority.
- This first (first, etc.) opinion contains indications relating to the following items:
 - ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
 - ☐ Box No. II Priority
 - ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
 - ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
 - ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
 - ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
 - ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
 - ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application
- The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(e).

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4bis. For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6. For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.
- The final date by which the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter II of the PCT) must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 12-09-2005

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/SE

Patent- och registreringsverket

Box 5055

S-102 42 STOCKHOLM

Facsimile No. 46 8 667 72 88

Authorized officer

Gordana Ninkovic/MN

Telephone No. 46 8 782 25 00

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IB2003/001829

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ This opinion is based on a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of:

- ☐ international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b))
☐ publication of the international application (under Rule 12.4)
☐ international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3)

2. With regard to the elements of the international application, this opinion has been established on the basis of (*replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed."*):

☒ the international application as originally filed/furnished

☐ the description:

pages _____ as originally filed/furnished

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

☐ the claims:

pages _____ as originally filed/furnished

pages _____ as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

☐ the drawings:

pages _____ as originally filed/furnished

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

☐ a sequence listing and/or any related table(s) – see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing.

3. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

☐ the description, pages _____

☐ the claims, Nos. _____

☐ the drawings, sheets/figs _____

☐ the sequence listing (*specify*): _____

☐ any table(s) related to the sequence listing (*specify*): _____

4. ☐ This opinion has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

☐ the description, pages _____

☐ the claims, Nos. _____

☐ the drawings, sheets/figs _____

☐ the sequence listing (*specify*): _____

☐ any table(s) related to the sequence listing (*specify*): _____

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IB2003/001829

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	<u>1, 5, 21, 25, 36 (NO)</u>
	Claims	_____
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	<u>1-36 (NO)</u>
	Claims	_____
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	_____
	Claims	_____

2. Citations and explanations:

Documents cited in the International Search Report:

A US 2003080901 A1 (T.E.Piotrowski), 1 May 2003
B US 2003014186 A1 (T.A.Cofino et al), 16 January 2003
C EP 0942345 A2 (Webb Int Co Jervis B), 15 September 1999
D EP 0763712 A (Union Switch & Signal Inc), 19 March 1997

The most relevant documents are A and B. Documents C and D represent the state of the art.

Present invention relates to a method for navigating within navigation area, involving navigating desired route by passing navigation tags of sequence of navigation tags, such that passing of navigation tag is acknowledged.

Document A discloses a radio frequency identification navigation system for a building complex. The system has a radio frequency tag with unique binary code as a predetermined signature, and a receiver having RF tag reader capable of reading the predetermined signature. The unique code is associated with a location of the RF tag. Navigation information related to all tag locations is stored a memory. The navigation information may also include a digital map of the building complex or region and the locations of the tags would be identified in the digital map. Based upon the current position, instructions can be provided and transferred to a tag reader to help the user to reach a specific location. (See page 2, part 0030-0032; claim 1; fig.2).

.../...

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.
Continuation of: BOX V

Document B discloses a position detecting device for providing navigational aids for users, comprising RFID tags and an RFID transceiver, which stimulates and reads data from the RFID tags. The transceiver may also write data to the RFID tags. The device has memories storing position points of the tags that define respective location within physical areas. A path process defines one or more paths connecting one or more of the position points in response to a user query and accesses the information to determine the progress of a user through the physical area. A user interface communicates the progress through the physical area to the user. (See page 2, part 0026-0035; claims 1-4).

In a view of what is known from each of documents A and B (see specially A) the invention as described in claims 1, 5, 21, 25 and 36 is not considered to be novel.

Remaining claims only contain features which are either disclosed in cited documents or are not considered to go beyond what can be expected from a person skilled in the art, especially since the advantages thus achieved can be readily contemplated in advance. Therefore the subject matter of these claims is not considered to involve an inventive step.